

Application Serial No: 09/977,900
In reply to Office Communication of 22 August 2005

Attorney Docket No. 80072

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-7, 11-13, 15, 18 and 19 are currently in the application. Claims 2-7, 11-13, 15, 18 and 19 stand rejected, and no claims are allowed. By this response, claims 2-7, 11-13, 15, 18 and 19 are canceled without prejudice, and new claims 21-33 are added.

Applicant has extensively revised the claims and republished them as a method claim 21 with dependent claims 22-30 and an apparatus claim 31 with dependent claims 32-33. These claims have approximately the same scope as the previous claims and do not incorporate new matter.

Concerning claim 21, Applicant respectfully suggests that the ability to show different files in a coordinated manner is not taught by Bookspan or any of the other cited prior art. Furthermore, Bookspan does not teach a scenario file associated with each computer for giving the beginning time for playing a particular file on the computer because Bookspan teaches a broadcast of a single presentation to multiple computers. While the well known Network Time Protocol taught by Mills allows synchronizing the clocks of a plurality of independent computers, neither Bookspan nor Mills show any motivation to incorporate this in multiple connected computers to allow different files to be shown in a coordinated manner.

Application Serial No: 09/977,900
In reply to Office Communication of 22 August 2005

Attorney Docket No. 80072

Bookspan does not teach playing individual graphic files, sound files or executable files as claimed by Applicants in claims 22-24. Applicant further suggests that Bookspan does not teach any of the methods for giving a play duration taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 25-27. Claim 28 is not shown in the prior art because Bookspan only provides for showing a single presentation and does not teach the use of multiple display device showing different files in a coordinated manner. Applicant further suggests that neither Hogle IV nor Bookspan teach a scenario file having commands indicating which display device a particular file should be displayed on. It is further suggested that Hogle IV does not teach use of a composite raster area for setting the coordinates of a displayed file within a coordinated presentation.

Concerning claim 30, Applicant also suggests that the prior art does not give the user an opportunity to select one of several scenario files as claimed by Applicant in claim 30. This would be contrary to the teachings of Bookspan because Bookspan teaches a broadcast method for showing a plurality of users the same presentation.

Concerning claim 31, Applicant suggests that none of the prior art teaches showing different coordinated displays. Furthermore, none of the prior art teaches loading or providing different presentation files on several computers. Multiple

Application Serial No: 09/977,900
In reply to Office Communication of 22 August 2005

Attorney Docket No. 80072

scenario files are not taught by the prior art that work in conjunction with a control program to deliver different coordinated displays. Concerning claims 32 and 33, none of the cited prior art teaches a display of different files on different ones of multiple displays associated with a computer as coordinated by a scenario file.


Applicant respectfully suggests in view of these remarks that all grounds for rejection and objection have been removed by the foregoing amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are therefore earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone James M. Kasischke, Attorney for Applicant, at 401-832-4736 if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a telephone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of the subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE W. STEVENS

16 September 2005

By 
JAMES M. KASISCHKE
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 36562